



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,152	04/27/2001	Osamu Sameshima	43890-513	7309

7590 04/18/2003

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

SAJOUS, WESNER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/843,152

Applicant(s)

SHMULEWITZ, ASCHER

Examiner

Wesner Sajous

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to application serial number 09/843,152, filed on April 27, 2001, including the preliminary amendment dated August 27, 2001. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. The drawing corrections filed on August 27, 2001 has been accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik, US Pat. No. 6,219,553, in view of Chan et al. (hereinafter Chan), US Patent No. 6,397,256.

Considering claim 1, Panasik, at fig. 1a, discloses a wireless display system comprising:

Art Unit: 2676

Plural personal computers (e.g., item 18 of fig. 1a and item 22 of fig. 1b) having wireless communication function (see col. 3, lines 42-50, and col. 4, lines 25-40); and

A wireless display (14) having wireless communication function and a display function (see col. 3, lines 42-50). Panasik, at col. 3, lines 43-45, stated that the room configurations of fig. 1a could be used with a network of mobile computing devices, such as PDA, notebook computers, graphing calculators. This implication implies that Panasik discloses a display unit including a display function.

It is noted that although Panasik suggests that student responses can be evaluated by the teacher while class is conducted (see col. 3, lines 59-61), Panasik fails to specifically disclose that the display unit of the wireless display (e.g., the teacher's calculator 14) displays screens of some of the plural personal computers (e.g., the students' calculators 18).

However, Chan, in a similar art, teaches a monitoring unit including a display, which is remotely disposed from at least one computer, displays [screen] snapshots of video images displayed on the display of the at least one computer (see col. 1, lines 54-60), and/or monitoring a plurality of display access units concurrently (see col. 2, lines 31-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have considered to modify the wireless network communications of Panasik to include the use of a display of screen snapshots and the monitoring a plurality of display access units concurrently (see col. 2, lines 31-37), as taught by Chan. The modification would have been for the purpose of providing a

Art Unit: 2676

simple and effective way of monitoring plural computer users or students to thereby prevent them from making unnecessary errors and to help the teacher in determining whether or not the users or the students are grasping the principles as they are being taught. See Chan col. 1, lines 26-29.

Re claim 2, it is noted that although Panasik suggests that student responses can be evaluated by the teacher while class is conducted (see col. 3, lines 59-61), Panasik lacks implicit recitation for the plural personal computers are displayed simultaneously by dividing the display unit of the wireless display.

Chan, in a similar art, teaches the monitoring or displaying of a plurality of display access units concurrently and the viewing of screen snapshots videos of at least one computer (see col. 2, lines 31-37). The Applicant should duly note that in order for the monitoring unit to display the video screen snapshots including the monitoring of the display units concurrently, the display of the monitoring unit would have to divide its display into different sections to display the screen snapshots of video displayed on of the at least one computer, and/or to allow the monitoring unit to concurrently monitor the plurality of display access units. Each divided section would represent data for a particular display computer of the plurality computers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have considered to modify the wireless network communications of Panasik to include the cited features of Chan; for the purpose of providing a simple and effective way of monitoring plural computer users or students to

Art Unit: 2676

thereby prevent them from making unnecessary errors and to help the monitoring unit or the teacher in determining whether or not the users or the students are grasping the principles as they are being taught. See Chan col. 1, lines 26-29.

Re claim 4, Panasik [intrinsically] discloses the wireless display (14) has an input function, the plurality of personal computers are operated through wireless communication by using the input function of the wireless display (see col. 3, lines 41-50). The Applicant should duly note that the teacher's calculator 14 disclosed by Panasik enables the teacher to communicate to the students (see col. 3, lines 41-50, and col. 4, lines 26-40), it therefore, incorporates an input function; in order to allow the teacher to communicate information to the students.

Regarding claim 5, Panasik teaches that the student calculators 18 (or notebook computers or PDAs), which are wireless, are capable to communicate between themselves (see col. 3, lines 44-50), which corresponds to the claimed limitations including some of the plural personal computers are operated by displaying the screens of some of the plural personal computers.

Panasik fails to teach the simultaneously display.

Chan teaches the simultaneously display (e.g., monitoring or displaying of a plurality of display access units concurrently (see col. 2, lines 31-37). As suggested above (see claim 2 rejections), the monitoring unit (or display unit), in order to enable concurrent or simultaneous display, it would have to divide its display into different

Art Unit: 2676

regions; in order to display access unit of more than one computer concurrently. Each divided section would represent data for a particular display computer of the plurality computers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wireless network communications of Panasik to include the concurrent display suggested by Chan; in order to provide a simple and effective way of allowing the computer users or students to communicate between themselves.

Re claim 6, Panasik, at fig. 1b, [intrinsically] discloses the wireless display (14) includes a touch panel that has the input function. The Applicant should duly note that because the system of Panasik of fig. 1a can be used with a network of mobile electronic devices (see col. 3, lines 41-45), such as PDAs, it therefore incorporates a touch panel that has the input function, for such is an industry standard. Thus, item 14 of Panasik includes a touch panel that has an input function. This would enable the teacher to communicate information to the students. See Panasik's col. 3, lines 56-58.

As per claim 7, the claimed "common operation screen of plural personal computers is displayed in the wireless display, and same operation is done simultaneously in the plurality of personal computers" is obviously met over the teaching of Panasik at col. 3, lines 60-62, because in order for the teacher, which corresponds to the wireless display, to evaluate the student responses as class is conducted, the

Art Unit: 2676

operation performed by the students (e.g., student responses as common operation screen of the plural computers) must be done and displayed simultaneously on the teacher's display. Thus, it would have been obvious to modify the teaching of Panasik in order to inform the teacher whether the students are grasping the principles as they are being taught.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3, and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Reasons For Indicating Allowable Subject Matters

After conducting a variety of database searches, the Examiner respectfully submits that the prior art of record (see PTO-892 Form) fail to teach a wireless display system comprising: "when changing over and displaying the screens of plural personal computers in the wireless display, the screen is changed to a desired personal computer according to transmission of a specific code from the desired personal computer, or information identifying the desired personal computer is displayed" as recited in claim 3.

In addition, the prior art fail to teach a wireless display system comprising: "a desired personal computer to be operated is specified by touching the personal computer screen displayed in the wireless display by the touch panel" as recited in claim 8).

Art Unit: 2676

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record, considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure, and are not relied upon herein, are as recited in the attached PTO-892 form.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Box

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for technology center 26000 only)

Or:

(703) 308-5359 for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED"

or DRAFT")

Hand-held delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 6th floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesner Sajous whose telephone number is (703) 308-5857. The examiner can be reached on Mondays thru Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached at (703) 308-6829. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-6606.

Wesner Sajous


4/16/03